

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 500

CS 502 769

AUTHOR Hinkle, G. H.; Narramore, W. D.
 TITLE Art as Participation: The Use of An Aesthetic Model as An Interdisciplinary Teaching Method. Pilot Version.
 PUB DATE Jan 80
 NOTE 66p.
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Aesthetic Education; Course Descriptions; Course Evaluation; Educational Assessment; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Pilot Projects; *Team Teaching; *Theater Arts

ABSTRACT

A pilot version of an experimental course in aesthetics and theatre is described in this report. Divided into seven sections, the report (1) explains how the course was designed for effective team teaching and for optimum student participation, (2) summarizes the characteristics and levels of commitment of the 27 undergraduates in the pilot course, (3) describes the operation of the 14-week course, (4) describes the individual projects that two students undertook independently within the course, (5) discusses the evaluative devices used and their varied assessments of the course, (6) evaluates the course with respect to both incorporating it into the college curriculum and exporting it elsewhere, and (7) estimates the operating cost of the course. Appendixes include the original course proposal, the course syllabus, a student evaluation plan and forms, a sample course examination, an audience evaluation mailing, and the proposal and grant budgets. (AEA)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED181500

REPORT
to
AAC/PROJECT QUILL
on
Proposal 3-A-103

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"Art as Participation: The Use of An
Aesthetic Model as An Interdisciplinary
Teaching Method"

Pilot Version of An Experimental
Course in Aesthetics and Theatre

Formulated, Conducted, and Evaluated:
August '79 through January '80

by

G.H. Hinkle and
W.D. Narramore

at

Austin College

in

Sherman, Texas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G.H. Hinkle

W.D. Narramore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Note Concerning
Supplemental Materials:

The theatre production phase of the experimental course described herein may claim the interest of some readers of this Report. They are advised that a limited supply of play programs detailing that production is available, as well as a full-length video taped performance especially prepared for distribution.

Readers desiring copies of the program or access to the televised version of the play are invited to write Drs. Hinkle and Narramore at Box 1550, Austin College, Sherman, Texas 75090, or to call them at (214) 892-9101, Ext. 245.

CS502769

CONTENTS

Dedicatory Preface p. 2

Report on the Experiment:

- A. From PROPOSAL to PILOT -- designing the course for effective team teaching and for optimum student participation in the experiment's "process" model/method p. 3
- B. From VOLUNTEERS to VOTARIES -- characteristics and levels of commitment of the twenty-seven undergraduates in the pilot course p. 8
- C. From SYLLABUS to STAGE -- fourteen-week recapitulation of the operation of the pilot course p. 11
- D. From EXPECTATIONS to EXPLORATIONS -- "projects within the project" attempted in-and-through the pilot course p. 21
- E. From ATTITUDE to ANALYSIS -- the several evaluative devices and their varied assessments of the pilot course p. 26
- F. From REAPPRAISALS to REPETITIONS -- evaluating the pilot course respecting its future at Austin College and its exportability elsewhere p. 31
- G. From BUDGET to BALANCE SHEET -- financial statement and estimate of operating cost of the experimental course independent of external funding p. 34

Appendices:

- A. Hinkle/Narramore Proposal to Project QUILL
- B. Course Syllabus
- C. Student Evaluation Plan and Forms
- D. Course Examination
- E. Audience Evaluation Mailing
- F. Proposal and Grant Budgets

DEDICATORY PREFACE

We well might dedicate this Report to our colleagues and peers in higher education. Were we to do so, certainly Dean Dan Bedsole of Austin College and Professor George Hazzard, national director of Project QUILL, would head our list for their sustained interest and specific help in fashioning an acceptable proposal. Also included on such a list would be Professors Myron Low, David Schrader, and Harry Thompson of Austin College whose attention to their roles as campus evaluators of our venture yielded quite meaningful results. Not to be overlooked either would be our colleague, Professor Dan Setterberg, whose enthusiasm and expertise combined to give us a first-rate video documentation of the production phase of our experiment. Similarly, Professors John McDermott, and Webster Smalley, who served as external critics of our effort, would deserve recognition in that regard.

With good reason we might instead dedicate the Report to the twenty-seven Austin College Students who self-selected into the pilot version of our learning-by-doing course offering, and thereby assumed the very high risk of wasting tuition and talent, intellect and energy on an undertaking which at the outset manifest as many potential pitfalls as it did promises. Within these pages we attempt to highlight in every way possible the extraordinary contribution their commitment to our proposal made to its largely successful outcome. We wonder, nonetheless, if what we record herein on their behalf corresponds adequately to what they themselves may think they accomplished; for, as one of our colleagues on the Austin College campus is fond of noting, "The courses we teach are not necessarily the courses our students take."

The fact is, however, that we dedicate the Report to our wives, "Annie" and "Bec." They represent a rare species among marriage partners in that both of them possess a range of competence and have reached a level of professional involvement independent of our own; so that, as a consequence, they can and do allow us to be our somewhat zany selves without need of apology or excessive concern for their inclusion in, or approval of, our carryings-on. We could not ask for a better display of love or for a greater degree of latitude.

G.H. (Jerry) Hinkle
W.D. (Dub) Narramore

Austin College
January 1980

A. From PROPOSAL to PILOT

A character in the play performed at the close of the Hinkle/Narramore Project QUILL experimental course delivered himself of the following opinion:

Let me tell you somethin' -- and tell you
so's you don't forget it. Religion can
cover over all sorts of goin's-on, if a
body has a mind to let it.

Much the same might be said for our pilot venture in interdisciplinary team-teaching; for, like religion as portrayed above, it resulted in so varied a set of data that we easily could shift the evidences of success and failure to camouflage "all sorts of goin's-on." Specifically, we could reiterate that data by beginning with the play performances and simply "read back" our enthusiasm and that of our campus for them to "cover over" several initial and mid-term failures on our parts. We shall not do so, however, but instead will first rehearse that conflicting array of objectives and expectations which we and our students had to reconcile at the outset of the experiment.

There was, to begin, the matter of meeting the anticipations of Project QUILL nationally. We feel most fortunate in that respect; for we remain uncertain whether or not those anticipations were dealt with adequately in our proposal. Insofar as we can judge from published accounts of other proposals receiving grants to date, ours was more the exception than the rule. By way of broad comparison, it appears to have been more exotic, more expensive, and more theoretical than most.

In calling it exotic we make no peculiar claim for the proposal's merits (e.g., that it was "more innovative" than the others), but instead merely remind readers that a yoking of aesthetic inquiry with the art of the theatre smacks of illegitimacy in any number of scholarly circles. Among the modes of traditional philosophic investigation, for example, aesthetics has always been the "step-child." It is beset with unclear criteria and plagued by inconclusive findings. Similarly, theatre more often than not is viewed as a "ragtag art," as a conglomeration of other arts which separately are easy to delineate, but which taken together defy articulation. It appears to many to be an amorphous mixture of ideas and activities too varied and too happenstantial -- however creative -- to designate any one of them as being pivotal in fashioning the "art" which a play production actualizes. Respecting the Hinkle/Narramore proposal, moreover, the already suspect nature of both disciplines alluded to here was taken not to be a reason for cautious experimentation, but rather a justification for radically amplifying the ambiguity of aesthetics and theatre in-and-through a model and a methodology rooted in the concept of "process" (see Appendix A).

As for the expense of pursuing the model/method, it was figured at nearly one-hundred dollars per student. Many of the other proposals receiving the blessing of Project QUILL thus far involve, by way of contrast, entire class years of undergraduates or at least a substantial cross-section of a campus population. Ours instead promised only a pilot group of normal class size gleaned from a handful of volunteers at an institution where even its total enrollment, duly cross-sectioned, would provide a very limited sampling of liberal arts students. If for no other reason, then, the proposal's budget alone was enough to render it unacceptable on a "cost efficient" basis.

Finally, theory so-dominated the proposal that its only "practical objective" was to demonstrate that the "process" model/method was a viable one. That specific subject matter or skills would be acquired by the students taking part in the experiment was assumed, to be sure; but the how of that acquisition was more at issue than the what, leaving our proposal open to the charge that two instructors from two disciplines would be hard at work for a college term doing together with difficulty precisely what with ease they could accomplish separately and without risk of confusing subject matter, methodologies, or student backgrounds and interests. In a word, the question of whether or not the "process" need be entered into at all was bypassed in favor of insisting on its worth independent of its necessity -- not unlike an "art for art's sake" plea wherein our proposal's "learning-doing" rationale served that shopworn argument metaphorically!

Project QUILL's primary objective of underwriting experiments promising ready utilization in other liberal learning settings, therefore, was dealt with rather indirectly in the proposal. In fact, we did (and we still do) believe that such utilization -- if not need as well -- was quite arguable, and that our experiment promises an enhancement of both a critical and a technical grasp of a performing art on the part of students introduced to our model/method; but the proposal per se provided no such guarantee.

Also to be reconciled were differences in training and experience, in skill and style, between the two of us. As it turned out, that reconciliation was the simplest of the three to achieve, the most effective, and the most satisfying.

Although we are a Damnyankee and a native Texan respectively and nearly a decade apart in age, we are both from small towns, both all-but-unique among members of our two lower middle class families in having gone to college, to say nothing of having secured graduate degrees, and both deeply indebted as a result to our several undergraduate and university alma maters for "opening up the world to us" as neither our relatives nor our hometowns could have. In addition, the Hinkle/Narramore teaching team manifest a complementary convergence of major and minor areas of expertise which reinforced greatly our knowledge of, and our

respect for, each others' role in the experiment. Hinkle's secondary teaching experience in Speech-Theatre on another campus and Narramore's undergraduate major in philosophy made us, in other words, either an "informed amateur" or a "certified authority" in the full range of subject matter covered in the pilot course.

Still another area calling for reconciliation that was agreed to well in advance of the beginning of the experiment was that of priorities of emphasis within the proposal itself. Together we attached primary importance to the learning-doing model/method itself and secondary importance to achieving a level of success in our mutual effort which would call attention in a new way to Austin College's already established reputation as an inventive, pathfinding institution. Very much to the point here is the fact that the College promised to underwrite our experiment, if we did not get a Project QUILL grant -- a display of confidence and encouragement which made us all the more determined to secure a place for Austin College in the ranks of grant recipients, and which gave us the energy and will to go through a second proposal submission process to convince Project QUILL reviewers of the viability of our venture.

What we had least in common, on the other hand, also played a positive role in our team endeavor: namely, the distinctly different "style" one associates with each of us in and beyond the classroom. Hinkle is essentially a "public" person, arrogant (even about his arrogance), and painfully fastidious. Students call him "hyper," when they are not calling him something worse. In counter-distinction, Narramore is the "private" sort, most creative when he is being most unobtrusive, and a master at controlling his own and others' tensions. Again, in the lingo of students he is "laid back."

This contrast, as should be obvious, made possible an assignment of teaching and monitoring responsibilities throughout the experiment that meshed beautifully with our areas of expertise as well. For Hinkle to have directed the play would have landed the cast and crew in "the looney bin" where several of the play's characters in fact did end up following its next-to-last scene; but for Narramore to have handled the negotiations with seven on and off campus evaluators, to have organized all the public aspects of the production in addition to directing the play, and to have "kept the books," academically and financially, for the experiment would have tested his makeup and manner to the breaking point. In truth, both of us have done all of above ourselves on other occasions with reasonably good results. It remains the case, nonetheless, that Hinkle's serving as "dramaturge" and "manager" and Narramore's serving as "director" and "artist" was a division of labor which made the teaching team a model of the model, as it were; for the process and interaction between us was everywhere apparent throughout the course in the experience of the students, although at first (as a later section of this Report will note in

some detail) they were rather unsuccessful in accomodating to our complementary roles and personalities. Moreover, that was but one of several adjustments they were called upon to make.

Turning to those other adjustments, then, we need initially to characterize the expectations of our undergraduate volunteers as fairly as we can. In so doing, we recognize that our "reading" of the situation is only as accurate as the more obvious student reactions to this or that feature of the course suggested at the time. For that reason we have reserved for other sections of the Report both a detailed description of the pilot course's student enrollment and an analysis of its involvement in, and assessment of, the experience overall.

At this point, however, it is significant to note that the expectations of a number of the students ran ahead of the realities of the course and that the personal objectives of some of them courted likely disappointment from the start. Perhaps, the best way to make this clear is to compare Project QUILL's and our own objectives with those of members of the class. Whereas Project QUILL's concern for "exportability" of our model/method elsewhere in the future was paramount and our primary interest was in the worth of it as a concept in itself, the students could not have cared less about Project QUILL's aim and cared only secondarily about ours.

This is not to say that they did not cooperate or participate at an acceptable level in all aspects of the experiment. To the contrary, even what they did rather unwillingly or in a detached way constituted more than most students would commit themselves to under the best of circumstances; but it does provide the background needed for our stressing how very large the play production loomed in the minds of most all the students from the outset of the course. That it was only the "other side of the model/method coin," as we and Project QUILL understood it to be, escaped them. Whether they came to the course with theatre experience and a major in the Communication Arts department or with no such prior ties, almost all of them sought from the course either exposure on, or an introduction to, the stage.

This does not mean, however, that we had twenty-seven "stage struck" young people on our hands. Rather it is the best way we know to characterize in general a class enrollment which included both the student actor who looked upon the experiment as another "shot at a good part" and the science student who wanted for educational breadth the "inside story" of a performing art. For example, the accomplished senior actress who complained that the aesthetics and the theatre theory were not studied in enough depth was as typical of the group as was the junior biologist who invested intelligence and energy in a determined (and quite successful) effort to master the technical side of theatre.

These, then, were the objectives and expectations -- some anticipated by us in advance, some not -- which we sought to bring together in a manner worthy of our grant, in accord with our model/method, and appropriate to the students' needs and aspirations, academic and experiential. Rehearsing them here may appear to have been a shade too lengthy and complex an undertaking in the view of some readers of this Report; but we beg their indulgence as we attempt in the sections which follow to show how crucially related to the prospect for failure in our venture such conflicts of aims and priorities were and how essential the reconciliation of most of them was to its generally successful outcome.

So it is that we next review, each in turn, our selection of students for the pilot course, our fashioning of a syllabus and choosing of a play which would best serve our learning-doing experiment, and our subsequent expansion and evaluation of its viability as an interdisciplinary approach to "Quality in Liberal Learning."

B. From VOLUNTEERS to VOTARIES

Because of the registration projection plan in operation at Austin College, we had to begin our search for volunteers among students in November of 1978. We were seeking commitments, in other words, for a course which would not be offered until the following September. The same prior commitment applied to the pilot venture itself, since we had to arrange for our joint teaching "slot" with the Registrar and with our colleagues in two departments even before Project QUILL had assessed our proposal. In fact, our having to resubmit that proposal meant that we had nothing but campus support going for us well into the Spring Term of 1979.

Consequently, the thirty students who responded to our early call for interested parties likewise were required to anticipate their own college career needs for the greater part of the forthcoming academic year on the slim promise that inclusion in our experiment would be "different." When by April of 1979 the venture was confirmed as a Project QUILL endeavor, we had an additional waiting list of four more students and were faced with the problem of selection based on our initially determined class size of from twenty to twenty-five.

The thirty-four student volunteers, however, were so diverse in background and so well-divided among males and females and among three of the four undergraduate classes that we decided to accept all but the final four on the last-minute list. As we thought might happen, by September of 1979 three of the thirty selectees had felt it advisable or had found it necessary to drop out of the experiment; so that we began the pilot course with just a few students more than we had designed the experiment to accommodate.

The twenty-seven fell into categories of contrasts as ideal as they would have been, had we established those categories ourselves: eleven males, sixteen females; seven sophomores, eight juniors, eleven seniors, and one fifth year M.A. candidate from the Austin Teacher Program; fifteen Communication Arts (Speech-Theatre-Media) majors, five whose Communication Arts major was yoked with a second major in either Philosophy or Religion, and seven in other disciplines altogether (Art, Biology, English, History, Mathematics, and Political Science).

Four of the students were Austin Scholars (honors program for the top 3-5% of the student body); and among the seven sophomores two had been included as freshmen in the College's new Freshman-Sophomore Honors Colloquium experiment. While not so designated, an additional four class members were of "honors" calibre, having distinguished themselves in special academic arenas like Junior Year Abroad and the Washington Semester Program. The remaining seventeen volunteers were generally better-than-average students, although two or three of them "rounded out" our

sample even more by virtue of their having, here and there, a "bad grade" or a "bad term" on their records. Also contributing to our enrollment's "mix" was a student with a reputation as a chronic complainer. In all fairness, his "better side" gave evidence of keen-minded awareness; but, more true to form, throughout our particular venture he raised objections or "voted with his feet" at every point in the scheduled assignments and activities we were engaged in.

We had, then, a challenging and promising group of volunteers who demanded rightfully, if not always graciously, that we "make good" in response to the commitment we had elicited from them. We likewise had an enrollment whose collective judgment on the success or failure of the experiment could not be "explained away" by any manner or means.

It was in the latter regard especially that we had confidence (mixed with a drop or two of terror) in the validity of results to be obtained from the rather elaborate evaluation scheme which attended the pilot course. Any lesser group of students, academically or experientially considered, would not have tolerated with such good-natured complaint nor have entered into with such thoughtful resolve the evaluative instruments we thrust toward them at the outset of the course. It is not too much to say that the evaluation "assignment" was a "course load" in itself, carried by each student over and above textbook, class report, and examination obligations and in addition to cast/crew duties which occupied all but a few of the students for many hours of unscheduled "class time" during the latter half of the fourteen-week term.

The students' attention to such "second course" responsibilities was exceptional. Indeed, setting aside for now any coverage of the quality of their evaluative responses (see Section E), the case can be made on the basis of statistics alone. Granted that even small-group samplings are considered significant if there is a forty-percent return, our pilot group's commitment was, in fact, phenomenal:

<u>Evaluation Item</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Personality Inventory Instrument:</u>		
required of all students within the first three days of the course, in order that six of them could be "matched" with Hinkle and Narramore for a teaching style-learning style experiment conducted by other Austin College faculty under the auspices of H.E.W.'s Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE)	27 of 27	100%

<u>FIPSE Follow-Up:</u> teacher-student interviews, "recap" sessions, etc.	6 of 6	100%
<u>Five-Part Serial Questionnaire:</u> designed for weekly reflection throughout first half of course	26 turned in some sections	96%
	21 turned in all sections	76%
<u>Reflective Journals:</u> designed for periodic reflection throughout second half of the course	23 turned in	78%
<u>Philosophy Monitor's Sub-Group:</u> initial and follow-up interviews in depth	8 of 8	100%
<u>Theatre Monitor's Sub-Group:</u> lengthy round-robin group critiquing session at close of course	6 of 7	85%
<u>CAEL Monitor's Sub-Group:</u> reflective essays	5 of 6	83%

Note: The Five-Part Questionnaire and the Reflective Journal assignments were "blind" (see Appendix C); and students readily could have ignored them at no peril to their standing or grade in the course, as one of them did.

Finally, although we have reserved Sections C and D of the Report for fuller accounts of the students' commitment to the play production, we need to say here that it, too, was exceptional. Whether on stage or off, whether before an audience or in front of television cameras, cast and crew alike sustained a degree of concentration and manifest a level of intensity which impressed scores of Austin College students and faculty who otherwise were unacquainted with the other demands of our pilot venture noted above.

In short, "votaries" is the proper label for most all of our volunteers, as they transformed themselves from "select specimens" subjected to an experiment into self-possessed and self-motivated "corporate owners of the laboratory."

C. From SYLLABUS to STAGE

When in the latter part of August we reached agreement on the format for the pilot course's syllabus (see Appendix B), we exchanged two bemused observations which turned out to be far more prophetic and troublesome than we imagined at the time.

Narramore noted that in many respects what we had designed for the students was a "graduate school course" wherein the textbooks, lectures, and class reports would supply all the necessary perspectives on our subject matter, but wherein all the vital perspectives were to be made "only in the students' heads."

For his part Hinkle pointed out that, as in a good melodrama, "someone's got to be the 'heavy'" and that he was "it" by virtue of his taking on all presentations having to do with the "mechanics" of the course schedule, the evaluation scheme, and the follow-up on every assignment -- be it academic or experiential in nature.

Those two incidental reflections in fact bespoke the greatest shortcomings of our planning, as well as the most consistent problem areas we encountered throughout the first half of the fourteen-week experiment and to a lesser degree through its final week of operation. Furthermore, as readers of this Report in time will discover for themselves, the first of those two shortcomings dictates the character of what in Section F is singled out as the most needed alteration to the pilot course's format in the future. The second problem area, of course, calls for a major overhaul of Hinkle's personality and is, therefore, less likely to be corrected!

More seriously, Section E of the Report further catalogues in an evaluative context the unquestioned need for "programming" in a subsequent version of the course what we so cavalierly assumed students could do wholly for themselves with the sources and theories to which we exposed them.

All of the above, however, is better handled herein by specific reference to the Five-Part Serial Questionnaire (see Appendix C) results; and, in that regard, we need first to clarify what the Questionnaire's "ratings" meant to us, recognizing that they may not have meant quite the same to each and every student circling them. In brief, we considered a circled "Poorly" or "Quite well" to be a largely unqualified "nay" or "yea" respecting the general question: "Were the objectives of this portion of the course met in your view, and to what degree?" A circled "Adequately," on the other hand, we considered to be a signal that a student was of two minds regarding the general question; and we anticipated in the "Comments" space on the Questionnaire a spelling out of qualifying remarks in such cases.

The fact of the matter was that most students amplified in prose any and all of their responses, while a few merely circled a rating on every occasion. In other words, we have in hand a far fuller set of data in one sense; but in another sense it is a less clearcut set and much more difficult to convey in report form, short of rendering it in its entirety. It is no less useful, however, as we hope the example given in full below makes clear. We hope, too, that readers will note from that example how early in the course the twin problems of managing the subject matter and of enduring the Hinkle-directed "mechanics" of the experiment surfaced:

Questionnaire Sheet # 1
on the Opening Sessions of the Course...

The student who adopted the fictitious name, Tonto, circled "Quite Well," but wrote, "In my opinion the opening sessions fulfilled their objectives. Expectations of students were presented clearly and concisely, in the least amount of time possible. I must admit, though, that I was overwhelmed by the amount of evaluative work, such as questionnaires, special interviews, and journals. I realize that the evaluations are necessary, due to the experimental nature of the class; but I hope they never gain precedence over the learning itself. The second session, I believe, fulfilled its purpose, too, in giving an introduction to aesthetic theory. I especially appreciated the use of analogies such as the one concerning the puppy. It helped make a new and very confusing subject easier to understand."

Overall, the initial segment of the course received eleven "Quite Well," fifteen Adequately," and no "Poorly" ratings. Among the more interesting and revealing comments on the first questionnaire sheet were these:

"The structured nature of the experiment makes me feel as though I were a tiny instrument in a machine which will produce a work of art."

"It is obvious that Hinkle is in charge, and the whole thing gives me the feeling of the arbitrary and the totalitarian."

"I am surprised at the amount of philosophy involved in the course plan. In my opinion the class is too advanced for a lot of us."

"I've talked to others about this and they agree that the section dealing with the production is of primary interest. We like the play and are ready to take part in it!"

"Both of you, I feel, introduced your material well, even to the point of finding correlations between your separate opening presentations. Play your cards right, and this may work out!"

The next major segment of the syllabus, dealing with aesthetics in some detail, did not fare very well, however -- as the nature of some of the initial comments above gave notice it would not. Hinkle's lecture plan certainly made sense on paper; but its impact was something quite otherwise. He presented, in turn, several traditional philosophic assessments of art, in each case outlining the general tenets of the position taken and illustrating them from the works of two representative thinkers holding that position. The class report "team" of students in each case presented still another illustrative thinker in the same mold, and along with Hinkle tried to set before the group the issues, limitations, and the like associated with such an approach to art. Thematically, the lecture series moved from the most structured to the most process-oriented aesthetic theories, setting up the possibility for subsequent "process" analysis of theatre from the point of view of the theorists Narramore was to present.

The class reports on behalf of Hinkle's presentations, with one utterly silly exception, were more than adequate; but they gave evidence of real difficulty on the reporters' parts, and on only one occasion did they generate a real discussion among the class as a whole. Ratings for the aesthetics lecture series were three "Poorly," fourteen "Adequately," and only six "Quite Well." In addition three students failed to turn in Questionnaire sheets on the series, and never again rated the "learning" half of the course. Moreover, one of Narramore's EIPSE students expressed in no uncertain terms his disillusionment with Hinkle's effort. He was not alone:

"I found the various philosophic approaches confusing, hair-splitting, and uninspiring."

"The instructor's presentations generally were pretty clear, if rather unrelated to much that I think has to do with art as I enjoy it; but the student reports were obscure and difficult to understand."

"Some (not all) of the presentations and class reports made me very angry in that the philosophers' works were taken too lightly or treated in a very sketchy way -- just so many words rattled off by the professor and by the student reporters. Jesus, I get very scared, too, in front of people; and I think something should be done to ease the tension that is growing in this course."

"I came daily to class completely blank concerning the questions and the answers you laid on us; and I left the same way. Believe it or not, there are students in this course like myself who do have questions about art. Why don't you ask them what those questions are?"

So, then, with Hinkle "bombing in New Haven," as it were, we became aware (especially through remarks like the last one quoted above) that (1) our mutually-reinforcing complementary backgrounds and styles well may have been the reason why our working together so readily as an instructional "team" was possible, but that it was not guaranteeing at all the "team's" positive or productive impact on the students, and that (2) our emphasis on, and delight in, theory -- crucial as it was to our model/method -- had given us an intellectual and psychological "high" as professors which most of the students did not perceive nor were likely to acquire in the brief span of the "learning" portion of the format we had adopted.

What might be termed our "emergency correctives" in the face of this situation were rather easy to come by, really; for, first of all, both Narramore's style and the textbook read as background for his lecture series on theatre theory were mercifully "informal," allowing him simply to build his presentations (excepting the initial one on Aristotle) directly off what the students were reading; and secondly with a concern for the forthcoming production half of the course, we scuttled our original plan to involve Hinkle directly in the rehearsing of two scenes to which he might have contributed some special understanding. To be sure, we knew from the outset that it was never advisable to "share" a director's role except in such a limited fashion; but now we knew that even a limited co-directing approach would be unwise. For the same reason Hinkle decided to attend no more than twice a week rehearsals of any kind, and pledged himself further to "speak only when spoken to" when attending them.

How right we were in making such correctives, particularly the second one, came home to us in one of the student actresses' journals at the end of the course; for, despite Hinkle's uncommonly restrained presence now and then at rehearsals, she wrote of how "unnerving his sitting there, thinking God-knows-what, was for me!" In the same regard, the most inventive, memorable comment of this kind was the one suggested by a crew member: that her only aesthetic decision in the whole course was made on that workday when she found Hinkle stuck in the freight elevator and had to decide whether or not to rescue him!

Narramore did not escape criticism altogether for his theatre lectures; but the variety of his presentations helped tremendously, as did the circumstantial introduction of a demonstration of the art of mime which substituted for a filmed NOH Play which never

arrived in the mail. Fifteen students rated Narramore's effort "Quite Well," eight "Adequately," and none "Poorly." Student reports also were clearer and were entered into more enthusiastically, although students remained their own worst critics in that regard and rarely gave one another the benefit of knowing much worth discussing at the close of each report. By and large, Narramore -- even Hinkle on days when he was in a risk-taking mood -- had to pick up on substantive issues and on interconnections between his and the students' presentations. Similarly, although they raved about the textbook on theatre, they were hard-pressed on most occasions to engage with Narramore in issues he raised in light of its content.

With responses to the Questionnaire on Narramore's segment of the syllabus running generally in a favorable direction, the real insight into how the course was doing overall came "by indirection" within those responses. The best student expression of a sense of failing and frustration, but by no means the only one, follows:

"Somehow I need to express (constructively) my disappointment in the method applied in the first half of the class. I don't know 'to what' to give responsibility for the inadequacy of the course; but I feel as if I've just spent seven weeks in one small evening, reading the materials in preparation for being tested on them. Otherwise, those seven weeks have disappeared in a fog. I wish that there had been some sort of enthusiasm for this part of the course, and that we had been 'taught' what it was we were supposed to be putting together."

A few other student reflections on Narramore's lecture series itself bear repeating here as well:

"The class reports were excellent here, as were the lectures. I felt the theatre theoreticians were taken more seriously than the class took the philosophers. I'm still not sure what Aristotle had to do with all this (either aesthetics or theatre), but the textbook was wonderful."

"Wish we could have tied things together a little more in class, or is that our job in the exam?"

"We learned the theories and discussed some sample plays and performances; but I still wonder about how these theories are applied. It's difficult to conceptualize without actually attending theatre events."

"One thing that's been hard is that I'm not a theatre major and Narramore was forever giving examples from plays. I feel like I didn't get the whole connection, because I'm not familiar with the plays."

"The only problem I have is synthesizing things from Hinkle's lectures. I feel that I've forgotten a lot when I try to relate the philosophy to the more recent theatre theorists."

Although two more students abandoned the effort in the process, the Questionnaire responses to the film analysis segment of the syllabus were quite positive: fifteen "Quite Well," five "Adequately," and one "Poorly." The single negative response, however, pointed up a rather general feeling among the students on this score. Impressed as they were with Narramore's expertise in the medium of cinema (an area of training and teaching he had pursued regularly on another campus, but not since coming to Austin College), they nonetheless looked upon it as a subject deserving of course-length exploration on its own merits rather than as an "added attraction" or "theatre-like example" in our interdisciplinary model/method:

"I think the problem of this section was lack of time. I found the discussion very intriguing, but too abbreviated."

"What was done was done well; but film as an art medium really deserves more time and depth."

"I don't feel the objectives of this course would suffer with the omission of the film section; but I do feel the College should offer courses in this kind of thing."

"I understand how film is an aesthetic experience of a unique kind, but I don't feel it should have been included in this course. The course should not diverge to yet another form, unless it fully covers it. I also found the film presentations and discussions, given directly before our exam, distracting."

The reference immediately above to the examination (see Appendix D) serves us here as a point-of-departure for reporting on that singular "integrating experience" we devised expressly to knit the disciplines and materials encountered throughout the first half of the course together. For all their expressed fears of it and for all the obvious agonies they suffered in preparing for it, the students did exceptionally well. Specifically, twenty-four of them supplied thoughtful and well-expressed answers of the B-Plus or A calibre; one turned in a C-Level exam; and the two who "froze up" at its midpoint subsequently researched and turned in agreed-upon

essays which matched the high-level answers they had given to the fifty-percent of the examination they did complete on the first try. In short, while it had to take place "wholly in their heads" to a degree for which we are more to blame than they, much of the theory was integrated and illustrated textually to a very satisfying extent; and, more importantly, it seemed to renew the spirits of instructors and students alike.

That the latter was true became evident, when the response to the "transitional" segment of the experiment were turned in. Following the exam day and leading into the play production phase of the course, that play-analysis "bridge" earned ratings which were within one point of paralleling those earned by the segment on film: fourteen "Quite Well," six "Adequately," and one "Poorly." A sampling of those final Questionnaire returns follows:

"I enjoyed very much these two class sessions -- very open and honest where everything began to take shape for us, the likely success as well as the limitations of what we were going to do during the production period. Hinkle's discussion of the play gave a new dimension to it for me. Narramore -- bravo!! The play really did switch hands, when Dr. Hinkle put the period on his last sentence and Narramore capitalized the first letter of his account of the 'nuts and bolts' of stage design, etc."

"The whole class has been very anticipatory from the beginning about the production. You two did a good job of making us even more curious about the play's 'becoming' a finished product."

"I am really looking forward to this segment of the course; and after hearing more specifically about it, I expect it to reinforce the 'theory' portion of the course. If this does occur, I think the experiment will have been very successful in that respect."

We leave to the student who submitted all Questionnaire sheets under the name, "Natasha," the task of bridging best the "learning" and the "doing" halves of the pilot venture from the ideal class perspective. In fact, all along "Natasha's" comments were thorough and thoughtful, far-ranging and insightful, and always "up beat" even when taking a critical turn. What "Natasha" wrote was two-fold; and we cherish its first reflection for ourselves, because so few of the other students saw us as we saw ourselves, and the second for the entire enrollment in the experiment, because its declaration proved happily to be prophetic for most all of them.

"Your enthusiasm is invigorating -- that comes across best of all the objectives I think. To see two men so wrapped up in a class makes me feel important myself. To portray art as 'event' or 'process' is not just a section goal in this course, but the 'whole' of the course, isn't it? You've made that point 'live' for me..."

"Your analyses of the play were very interesting and gave me some insights as to its structure and undercurrents. Still and all, I have my own impressions of the play -- I think that's extremely important. It's not your play anymore. It is ours."

We have reserved Sections D and E of the Report for our own and the students' experiential assessments of the play production. Consequently, we report here on only those special conditions and varied factors surrounding our choice of the theatre piece which "Natasha" and the rest of the class in short order claimed for themselves.

The most significant thing to be said for that choice is that it was made on purely utilitarian grounds. All the plays we considered, for example, had as their most common attribute a large cast with a good ratio of male and female roles and several levels of demand for acting talent (roles that "carried" a performance as well as roles in which less experienced actors could develop meaningful, but not excessively complex, characterizations worthy of their effort and important to one or another juncture in the plot). The play of our choice, moreover, had an additional "advantage" or two. In the first place, its being an untried drama fit the experimental motif of the pilot venture; and, were it to flop, we half-jokingly agreed to shrug our shoulders and declare, "After all, it was but one aspect of trial-and-error in the context of the whole model/method being tested." The point here is that we had no "world premier" mindset operating on its behalf, but rather were sticking as closely as possible to our primary emphasis on the learning-doing thesis of our Project QUILL proposal. Secondly, the play selected had a very straight-forward plot, despite its expressionistic and episodic structure, and was peopled by very basic characters, if not stereotypes. In a word, an audience would have no trouble whatever with the play, as they well might have, had we misfired with a Pinter piece, to cite only one example of "difficult" theatre. Thirdly, although some of the students came to detest Hinkle's way of putting it, the untried play had "lots of bells and whistles" (i.e., frequent confrontations of personality and opinion, two very "theatrical" scenes which could be played to the hilt, and a climax that chilled the blood -- whether or not it possessed dramatic intensity in the highest or fullest sense.)

Also of some consequence was the Fall Term '79 playbill on which our production was the final entry. Campus audiences were treated in late September to an exceptionally sensitive and wholly student-directed production of Vanities. It deserved and won accolades in all quarters; and was followed by an imaginatively-staged and well-crafted Othello. To say the obvious, our play lacked both the popularity of the former and the reputation of the latter; but we thought of that as an advantage of sorts, since it was comfortably "different" in theme and in form from the other two productions and might "make it" on that count alone, if need be.

That it "made it" on several other counts is much to the credit of the student cast and crew, as already noted and as yet to be underwritten with data elsewhere in this Report; but here it must be added that the success of our production was equally dependent on Narramore's secondary decision to stage it in so "theatrical" a manner that it ended up being the most complex production, technically speaking, ever mounted in Austin College's Arena Theatre. More 'bells and whistles," in other words!

In concluding this section of the Report we turn to what might be called a few of the "special outcomes" of our decision respecting the play to be performed, Narramore's choices of its cast, and the particular attention to staging and to other off-stage production demands which provided the student crew with nearly as varied a set of challenges and opportunities as that which the play afforded the cast.

Three members of the pilot group (one well in advance of try-outs) served notice that a pending community theatre group's production, Godspell, interested them. In the first instance, this was cleared without further concern; for the student in question "contracted" for, and carried out extremely well, primary responsibility for setting up the lighting effects called for in our production. Godspell's one weekend of performance concurrent with our own, in other words, would find us already enjoying the benefits of his technical effort and skill. In the other two cases, while again no problem of real consequence arose, the students involved in effect "defaulted" to the Godspell cast upon learning that they were assigned crew rather than cast roles with us. They were justified to a degree -- independent of the question of commitment to a course in which one is enrolled -- in that both of them were Communication Arts majors and, as one of them put it, "I feel I need as much acting experience as I can get at this point in my undergraduate work." Although they were somewhat less than "enthusiastically involved" as crew members, they at least helped out; and, interestingly enough, their insightful journals provided us with new perspectives on that age-old theatre tension between cast and crew.

On the more positive side and as a collorary to the first example above, the student who took charge of the lighting trained a class member who theretofore knew nothing whatever about such things and helped turn her into one of the best performance-related lighting operators an Austin College production has had in recent years. Moreover, the trainer himself did such an effective job on the complex lighting scheme that he chose to record its varied effects on photographic slides for use in his professional portfolio.

In the section of the Report following this one we will report on two other students in the experiment who undertook what we came to call "projects within the project" because of their special skill orientation and their excellent results; but here we would also mention in passing the young woman whose special talent as a singer became crucial in a role no lesser-talented member of the class could have developed with such full dramatic effect.

At this point readers may be asking the question we have asked of ourselves: namely, could it be that what we have experimented with successfully is a model/method for developing a fine cast and crew for a theatrical endeavor -- and that only? Certainly, the more "woeful" accounts in this section of the Report on student views of our "learning" segments in the syllabus might justify a conclusion of that order. In our own minds, however, we are less troubled by the "that only" aspect of such a conclusion than we are by the several ways in which we came very close to "pulling off" the first half of the course quite successfully as well, but for the lack of foresight. In short, as we remind ourselves of how blind we were initially to the obvious flaws in our syllabus and to the expansive notions we had of student interest and grasp regarding our disciplines, we are possessed of that "wait until next time" spirit which convinces us that a subsequent version of the course would undergird the model/method throughout the entire fourteen-week period.

D. From EXPECTATIONS to EXPLORATIONS

This section of the Report will be relatively brief, although we are tempted to make it among the longest. At least this is the case with respect to the very successful and exciting first of three "projects within the project" reported on below.

That particular undertaking -- the video-taping of a performance of the play -- went beyond our initial plans for it as a learning experience alone and also outdistanced the best hopes we and others involved in it entertained for its character and its quality. When devising the syllabus, we simply assigned the "off day" in our public performance schedule as a time for "running the show" before cameras. We secured the cooperation of our colleague in Media and agreed to a largely "documentation" level of execution.

It became increasingly likely within the first several weeks of the course, however, that both our colleague and one of our senior students were prepared -- indeed, eager -- to turn the effort into a departmental Individual Project of greater magnitude; and, once rehearsals began in late October and the talent and dedication of the cast became apparent, we raised the level of what we were attempting substantially. With the student in question committed to a detailed analysis of the emerging performance from the perspective of television, we moved rehearsals in the direction of conscious preparation for both audiences and cameras -- with all that that meant in terms of varied staging and the like. The new level called for a compromise somewhere between a fixed-camera "taped documentary" and a fully camera-oriented "television production."

The result is a well-performed, well-integrated eighty-minute tape complete with "fade in" titles, "rolled" credits, carefully focused scenes, and enhanced audio. Here and there, the limitation of having only two cameras where three are called for and that of having only partially reblocked acting to secure the better angle or close-up or composition make for a less-than-professional screening; but such shortcomings are outweighed by the scope of the undertaking as both a learning experience and a skilled activity. In fact, when one considers that direction and crew work on the television "side" of the effort were nearly as completely in the hands of students as was the performance our experimental class members mounted, it can be said that few undergraduate institutions anywhere even allow for such an undertaking, much less fashion a product of the calibre our students and those of our colleague in Media did.

Here, too, is the place to note that the video-taped venture illustrated to a singular degree what, in truth, was the intensity and concentration typical of the three "live" performances as well. That this is significant in the context of our experiment overall is borne out by the fact that the student, not we, engendered the

spirit and earned the enthusiastic reception which was detected in, and given to, the production by most all who saw it. We, after all, were determined to keep the model/method primary from beginning to end, therefore, we kept to a minimum (except where "learning" on the part of those students assigned as "House Staff" were concerned) all public announcements of the production. It was never featured, for example, in the media, on or off campus, apart from reference to its "learning-doing" purpose in the pilot course. No direct solicitation of an audience (again, on or off campus) was in operation. No admission was charged; and only an informal plan for reserving seats was instituted -- a mildly disturbing aspect of our minimalization, incidentally, once our cast and crew had "sold themselves" to overflow audiences and nearly a "half house" of would-be audience was turned away at the final performance.

"O, dem bells and whistles -- how they do bring 'em in!" Hinkle insists on noting here; but it is the student who analysed and directed the taping from the perspective of television who needs to be heeded seriously in this regard. His lengthy and insightful end-of-course journal is quite illustrative of our description above of this special feature of our experiment:

"... after the opening performance, I told Lisa, 'we're doing a good job. It is a good play,' and it really was. I was just hoping after the first performance that Saturday (taping day) would do justice to it, and that the cast would be able to stay in it.

"Well, as it turned out on Saturday, I needn't have worried about that.... All the preparation had paid off -- there were no serious problems, and the whole thing just went.

"I really enjoyed making the decisions we had to make as things came up; reblocking actors, etc.; but it was not a feeling of authority. Instead we were all working together, cast and crew, theatre and media students; and I was able to direct in a very enjoyable way.

"The cast was incredible. They were so patient, acted so well, kept their concentration, seemed to really enjoy what we were doing; and I also appreciated their interest in what was going on -- their questions, comments, and especially their compliments. I think we kind of surprised some of them with what we did."

The second "project within the project" also centered in the special interest and skill of a member of our experimental class. Assigned the task of House Manager, she turned her major in art as well as her gift as a photographer into both the creating of a very artistic thematic motif for our programs and posters and

into a photo essay project of her own design and doing which caught significant moments throughout rehearsals on film. As a result, we were able to design a lobby display which gave audiences a photographic glimpse at the "process" behind the performance they were to see, as well as a photographic record (done by professional photographer) of highlights of the "finished product" they would encounter on stage. This amplified in a most effective way the several "inter-connections" within a performing art on which so much of our model/method was based.

Equally important here is the end-of-course, end-of-experience journal our art student turned in; for it is unquestionably the best we have in hand -- both as a record of personal thought and feelings arising from exposure to our model/method and as an original piece of intellectual reflection on essential differences between objective and performed forms of artistic expression. Here, then, are but a handful of her thesis-like journal entries:

"There is a fundamental difference between objective art and performed art. Theoretically, some principles are the same and could be applied to both; but, respecting the 'eventfulness' of one's experiencing them, some aesthetic concepts and interpretations must be very different in each case.

"I can't experience the physical immediacy and reaction as much (as the cast), since I'm not actually out there performing.... My part in the production was over when the performance began, but I still couldn't watch the play as an objective thing. My psychic distance is gone. I feel kind of stuck in the middle concerning the experience of the performance. I feel detached from its action; but I'm too involved in it to see it undetached. My experience of it is not really active or passive. It's like the middle between cast and crew involvement generally -- both important and really 'real,' yet very different, though linked somehow.

"In studying art what fascinates me is what people think about it, their attitudes toward what they produce or encounter as artists and audiences, how they rationalize about art.... In theatre as in other arts, most new movements begin in rebellion against older traditions. But theatre is different from other arts in this activity. In comparison to painting, sculpture, and architecture (the things I usually study), theatre is very different. It is truly an 'event' instead of an object; so its rebellion doesn't last. It happens, and must be 'kept alive' as a mode of human expression more than some other modes (arts)."

As might be expected, any number of other journals (to be cited in Section E of this Report which follows) likewise reflected, if at all, on the action-oriented dimension of theatre. We suspect that this was the case not only because of theatre's inherent nature, but also because for most of our students the intellectual confusion and academic competition of the first half of the experiment simply "fell away" under the force of the cohesion and cooperation which dominated the "company" they had formed themselves into for the production.

We had hoped, in the same way, to elicit from a select portion of our several audiences a testimony to much the same action-oriented dimension and discerned involvement. That hope was conveyed by the third "project within the project" we undertook; but it was a hope which remained unfulfilled.

Together, we were convinced that with its attention properly focused an audience could reflect on the features and factors which make for the "whole action" of a theatrical performance. Accordingly, we fashioned a letter of invitation and a questionnaire (see Appendix E) designed to that end. Eighteen persons received our "audience reaction" mailing two weeks in advance of opening night: six Austin College students; six faculty members; and six Sherman residents. All six students were chosen at random; but three of the faculty members selected were known to be patrons of campus drama, while three were not known to us in that regard, either positively or negatively. As for the Sherman residents we contacted, all were friends of the College, but only two were known to be interested in theatre.

Five of the eighteen came to a performance and returned questionnaires. What is more disappointing than the limited number of responses, however, is the nature of those responses; for all five of them were so framed in the language of "personal impact" that no discernment of specific features or factors was in evidence. By way of example, one Sherman resident wrote, "I really can't answer this questionnaire, because I was too absorbed and overwhelmed by the performance to notice anything in particular. But it is a fine play, and I am grateful for the invitation."

We have come to three conclusions about this failed attempt at yet another "project": (1) that most people don't take risks in their planning for entertainment, but rather attend "sure things" only, by and large; (2) that audiences, even when given guidance in another direction, operate at an unreflective level of emotional rather than analytic "likes" or "dislikes;" and (3) that neither conclusion above may have anything whatever to do with why so few respond and did so with so little discernment! Perhaps, what we really underwrote with this minor approach to evaluation was that widespread unfamiliarity with theatre revealed in a survey conducted in the late 1950s. Its highlighting statistic was that less than nine-percent of the American populace has ever seen a live dramatic

performance. One is reminded of an equally arresting statistic of parallel consequence: namely, that during our nation's Revolutionary Era less than nine-percent of the populace attended church!

Our major evaluation efforts, on the other hand, were quite successful; and we turn now to giving as thorough an account of their findings as the scope of this Report will allow.

E. From ATTITUDE to ANALYSIS

were the task of gleaning all the pertinent data from over two-hundred pages of student journal entries merely monumental, we might attempt it; but such "gleanings" would yield little that was meaningful in its particulars for readers, since at least half of the journals deal in incidents or allude to contexts so dependent on the experiencing of the pilot course that reasonable annotation is out of the question. Consequently, we will extract entries for review in what follows which fit three broad categories of reference: (1) those which are largely "introspective" in character, (2) those which deal with the "hands on" opportunity afforded by a cast or a crew assignment, and (3) those which bespeak significant reflection on the overall intent of our model/method.

Before recapitulating such entries, however, we need to express a thought or two of our own concerning the general nature and content of this mode of evaluation. First of all, it was responded to by most of the students in more than adequate detail, the two one-or-two-page "journals" notwithstanding. Secondly and in a very different vein, we must point out that not only did four of our students fail to write journals, but also that some of them turned in specimens surprisingly out of character with other aspects of their participation in the experiment. As a case in point, one of the two male leads in the play, both of whom worked endlessly and with excellent results on their formidable roles, dismissed the journal exercise with a three-page semi-metaphorical "literary piece" and, in addition, failed to complete his assignment from our CAEL monitor. We have no interest in castigating that student or others of his kind here. We merely wish to point out that in several such instances we have nothing of evaluative significance, either theoretical or experiential, from certain students who otherwise were major contributors to the more successful features of the pilot venture. Thirdly, we differ between ourselves on the evaluative worth of the "introspective" journals. Narramore, an accomplished actor himself who stresses the "craft" of theatre over its more emotive dimensions, found such journals disconcerting, whereas Hinkle, whose philosophical specializations include Nineteenth Century Continental Romanticism, felt more at home with students' quasi-psychological vagaries -- rather like those of Schelling, Fichte, and above all, Nietzsche!

Turning to journals in our "introspective" category, then, we record below two entries, one representative of their highly personal style and the other typical of those devoted almost exclusively to exploration of an assigned role in the play:

"The thrill and the sadness of doing a last performance. Wow! What a combination. The show had a little different quality to it. It added almost a timid energy to my character.

I went through that show and felt pain, happiness, confusion, confidence, lack of confidence, and then sadness. I tell you, I was drained. But now the show's last line has been said, the stage struck, the props put away... it's been a little difficult to adjust... It has been the hardest show to put away from my mind."

"My character, I decided from the costume, was not a farmer, although the setting of the play was a rural community. He could have worked in the post office or a grocery store or for the garbage collectors; but his baggy dress pants would not allow him the farmer image like his counterpart played by John. I also was sure he was retired, living off Social Security and odd jobs -- like taking over Peters' Store when Jenny went to Willow Springs."

The "hands on" category of journal, by way of contrast, dealt only incidentally with the specifics of assigned roles or crew responsibilities, and instead focused on the comprehensive nature of immersion in the theatrical experience. Exemplary in this regard were entries of this order:

"As a crew member I saw the show in pieces, and felt involved beyond that only because I chose to attend rehearsals. I also saw the set come together in pieces. Then like magic everything was in place at dress rehearsal, and what a show! So, I remember seeing the show many different ways; and yet once it was put together I remember how it always seemed they were doing it for the very first time."

"I've just now really noticed for the first time how good the set is for this show... the costumes are marvelous. I feel that there is nothing that can get a person into their character more than costumes. Everything has started to feel right.... I think the audience was overwhelmed. I didn't look at them; but it was neat to listen to their reactions, and I could 'feel' how intent they were, leaning out of their chairs at points."

An additional kind of "hands on" reportage came from one of Hinkle's FIPSE students and several other non-theatre majors for whom both non-theatre/theatre and crew/ cast tensions were an initial worry, if not a threat. In all but two known instances, however, the sense of the "ins" and the "outs" was reconciled to a degree rarely experienced by either of us or by the more experienced theatre students for that matter. One of them expressed it especially well:

"Things seem to be progressing well. Acceptance in the group seems to be growing. I don't get the condescending attitudes from the actors that I thought I would (or did from some of them earlier). The sets and the lights are beginning to add to the atmosphere. They seem to isolate actors on the arena floor like animals in a cage. It is an odd feeling to know that I helped build that cage, a very necessary cage for the existence of the play which the crew alone contributed."

Nonetheless, as in an earlier account, it was our "Natasha" who seemed to be most insightful of all regarding that behind-the-scenes, in-but-not-of experience:

"I sat this morning staring out the window, thinking about how I needed to write something more in my journal, something conclusive, or philosophical. And then I saw Dub all bundled up in dark blue with a briefcase headed toward the other side of campus, toward Ida Green (Communications-Theatre building). I watched him until he no longer was in view, thinking about the play and how I fit into 'his family.' That's the strange thing -- I don't think I ever did. O, I participated. I learned. I felt with my stomach or my heart or whatever; but still now I feel alien. I guess theatre is not a place for shy people -- no, that's not right either. I made a worthwhile contribution. I needed to give of myself. I did, and it was exhilarating. But still... I wonder how theatre can make me feel so alive, so empty, so creative, and so introverted and 'outside' at the same time."

The eight or nine journals devoted to the mode/method's impact on their writers were, excepting for the House Manager's already singled out elsewhere in this Report, masterful attempts at being positive by students who were hard-pressed in that respect. From among the more illuminating and encouraging entries we have chosen these:

"I find much of the course's first half fading into my memory without effecting the way I see the actual business of creating a production. I think we may have tried to cover too much too quickly and should have concentrated more, as the textbooks did, on the 'process' approach to theatre and other performing arts. How relevant is it to say that our play has 'significant form,' or is 'so structured,' or creates a 'catharsis,' etc? But this note was supposed to explain why the process is relevant to the theatre experience, and the answer has something to do with the creation of meaning through the mastery of technical skills. The technical jobs do not hold in themselves the meaning of the play, but they make it possible."

"At times during the 'doing' half of the course I would have flashbacks to the 'learning' or philosophical part of the course. I would get a glimpse of what a particular aesthetician really meant... but I'm not sure I like the 'shotgun' approach to theory in the first half of the course. It is one thing to be an armchair artist and 'jaw' all day about being creative and 'artsy,' but it is another thing to become involved in an art form and risk the time and effort to produce or create something. Yet both are necessary; and one aspect of the course filled in loopholes in another aspect of it."

For all their determined effort to be "open" with respect to evaluation, however, the students (like the two of us) needed and received important judgments from those monitors and critics who viewed our experiment "from afar." All five of them served us effectively, however varied their approaches to their evaluator's role or distinctive their judgments turned out to be.

Declaring the experiment to be "eminently successful," our philosophy monitor delineated a series of specific critical judgments emerging from his well-executed student interviews. Among them were an "enthusiasm for the texts for the course" which next time should be used more directly in class, a "weakness" in the student team reports generally, and the suggestion that the play produced should be integrated into an earlier segment of the course -- at least for illustrative purposes, although he and his student interviewees disagreed with the idea of "presenting the play earlier," as was suggested by our CAEL monitor.

Admitting that he had no support for the latter idea among his select students, the CAEL monitor nonetheless made the very important point (borne out in two of the five papers students wrote for him) that "none of the students seemed to have a clear concept of what was meant by experiential learning nor recognized why it might be of value to them." He went on to say that, generally speaking, the course remained "compartmentalized" for most of our students, as if first they "learned" something and then they "did" something with little sensitivity to how much or how uniquely they had "learned by doing."

Respecting the above criticism, Hinkle's exchanges with other Project QUILL directors at the AAC Conference in Phoenix in early January included two more relevant accounts of similar situations on other campuses. At the University of Toledo it became obvious that students enlisted in experimental courses must be made aware that the very nature of trial-and-error learning models makes for a resulting "mix" of satisfying and unsatisfactory experiences. Otherwise they become unnecessarily critical of either themselves or the educational experiment. At the University of Maryland it became equally obvious that "developmental" or "integrative" models of instruction rarely have their desired effect on the great majority of students, especially those in the current tell-me-what-I-have-to-know-to-pass undergraduate generation.

Our theatre monitor placed special emphasis on the appropriate character of the play we chose, noting that it rested on movements of plot and on shifts in theme and in structure which themselves were "process-like," and thus allowed us to integrate, as some other plays might not have, the production experience with the theoretical rootage of our model/method. Overall, his evaluation concerned itself with the play as an effective theatre piece and with the importance of involving oneself in new dramatic works, stressing again how, theoretically and experientially, such involvement never fails to heighten the sense of the performing arts' demand for "active creativity."

The outside critics who witnessed a performance and met with the students at a subsequent luncheon were supplied in advance with the textbooks and the model/method rationale; but we assured them that they need not confine their exchanges with us to those materials. They took us at our word. The guest aesthetician, schooled in Pragmatism's propensity for seeing art as a microcosm of general human experience, expanded in a most vigorous way the experiment's and the play's focus on "living on the edge." Our guest authority on theatre, himself a playwright of note, explored possible alternative renderings of plot which our performance brought to mind. We had felt from the start that, whatever such prominent scholars brought to bear on our effort, their coming would provide students with two encounters with first-rate thinkers in our separate fields; and neither we nor the students were disappointed in that regard. Their visits, then, were "stimulating extras" for a cast and crew who had earned the right to that calibre of attention.

So it is that we are pleased for our students' sakes that all our evaluators had generally positive things to say about our pilot venture; but we are most satisfied ourselves with their pointed criticisms, giving us points-of-departure for framing yet another (and better) version of the course along lines explored in the next section of the Report.

F. From REAPPRAISALS to REPETITIONS

Several years ago Hinkle read a paper as part of a Humanities Symposium on the Austin College campus. Narramore was its respondent. The contention advanced in that presentation was as follows:

"Time and again, two quite unfruitful strategies for probing the arts have been the order-of-the-day: the philosophers' flawed attempts at 'locating' artistic expressiveness and the experiencing of art in one of its seemingly consistent and external aspects (in the formal features of the art object or in the emotional response of spectators, for example), and the artists' own musings resplendent with half-explained intentional nuances and half-apologetic or bellicose subjective asides."

For all its faults, we believe our pilot venture has demonstrated that such excessive philosophic "objectivity" as well as such introspective artistic "intuitions" can be counter-balanced effectively in the experience of undergraduates by our model/method. We further assert that the resulting "blend" of theoretical and experiential exposure to the creative components and the technical dimensions of a performing art like theatre are better grasped by students through a dual encounter of that kind than they would be under wholly separate conditions (i.e., a lecture-oriented course in aesthetics or cast and crew experience acquired exclusively under ordinary play production circumstances).

There, of course, remain justifiable occasions for philosophic inquiry into the arts in traditional classroom and course offering modes, as there will always be good reason for "putting on a play" without recourse to that undertaking's existential importance. Even so, we are of the opinion that the model/method we employed retains some real advantages over the best of separate treatments, because it captures (for a performing art at least) the essence of both the participatory and the reflective sides of what "creativity" is all about -- whether one chooses to accent its intellectual or its technical aspects in accord with a particular disciplinary perspective.

Whatismore, we believe that the questions which arise out of the admittedly limited success of our initial experimentation with the model/method are far from being unanswerable:

1. Is the model/method viable? Can both "learning" and "doing" take place to a legitimate and rewarding degree for most students involved? YES, particularly if more care is taken in preparing them for, and helping them through, the "cognitive-experiential transfer" which the model/method demands of them.

2. Does it really matter that philosophy of art and theatre theory be "applied"? YES, especially if (as in the case of even our flawed first attempt) the transfer of a class' mutuality as a "study group" engenders a sense of "being a company", once that class turns its energies toward cooperative cast and crew responsibilities.
3. Is the "academic yield" of such a course format diminished excessively by the "participatory commitment" which attends it? NO, insofar as more is understood by instructors and class members alike about the distinctive kind of learning which participation affords, especially in the case of a performing art.

As for the failings of the initial experiment, readers of this Report at this point probably could supply for themselves what we list below as needed correctives:

1. The model/method would be better served another time by more concentration and elaboration on less subject matter of both the aesthetic and the theatre variety.
2. The materials studied, moreover, should stay closer to the textbooks assigned and should be taught in a more integrated manner (e.g., Appendix D is a copy of the pilot course's examination, the second part of which well might serve as a model for such integrated, comparative accounts of major aesthetic and theatre theories and theorists).
3. Class "team reporting" should be curtailed or eliminated in favor of individual written assignments touching on sources and otherwise unexplored aspects of the materials and issues covered in class.
4. The play to be produced should serve as more than a "vehicle for participation," instead providing a significant example of an established theatrical genre which would justify its being included earlier in the course as illustrative source material for study and discussion (e.g., 1930s expressionistic theatre with an Elmer Rice play as its focus or 1950s absurdist-existentialist theatre with one-acts by Ionesco, Albee, and others under study and under production).

5. The course might be open only to advanced students in both disciplines and its size kept to "ensemble proportions" with the goal of "compacting" both its level of expectation and its range of interests -- but at no loss to the desirability of having a substantial number of non-theatre majors in its enrollment.

Finally, we would remind readers who are genuinely interested in attempting what we propose that, by and large, the "overload" of both preparation and execution with which we and our students had to contend throughout the experiment resulted from factors independent of the normal state-of-affairs in teaching and production: namely, the Project QUILL-prompted evaluation assignments and special arrangements and our own investment in elaborate staging, etc. which neither the model/method nor the play we chose demanded.

In short, everything we did could be greatly encapsulated or otherwise circumvented, depending on the interest and expertise, as well as the capability and capacity, of particular faculties, student enrollments, or theatre facilities. We know of no better way of underscoring this final point than by directing readers to Section G of this Report which follows and which makes crystal clear in budgetary terms how far we went beyond the ordinary or necessary range of the model/method's instructional and theatrical requirements.

G. From BUDGET to BALANCE SHEET

Rather than formulate a three-part comparison of our proposed budget, the subsequent one submitted after our proposal was accepted, and the tally of actual expenditures, we have placed the first two items in Appendix F of this Report, and will record only the actual expenditures here. We do so, in order to provide space for comments on our balance sheet entries designed to assist readers in separating the amount spent by virtue of the special character of our funded experiment from the likely amount needed by ourselves or others for conducting such a course under more commonplace conditions. We hope in this way to encourage the utilization of our model/method elsewhere, despite the otherwise discomfoting "budget overrun" which our figures below reveal.

<u>Expenditures</u>	<u>Item(s)</u>	<u>Comments</u>
73.45	"Working script" duplication of untried play mss.	Half of original projection, because the playwright absorbed substantial initial costs and students were charged a nominal fee for copies
73.45		
264.25	Set construction materials, costumes, special staging features, etc.	This is right "on target" in the second budget, but is a quite deceptive total. The Communication Arts department paid out an additional 425.00 in production costs, in part because of the recovery and re-use value of the materials purchased. Hence the production actually cost 1186.25, just a little over the normal expense of a major staging at Austin College. In addition, the same department has absorbed the basic time and materials cost of our television production, although its major expenditure (tape editing) constituted a "gift" from an alumnus who operates an editing firm
477.00	Play programs, posters, lobby display costs	
20.00	Fee to consultant on special effects	
761.25		

200.00	Film rental for instructional use	Slightly over budget, but fairly average
<u>200.00</u>		

250.00	Compensation to Hinkle and Narramore for August planning and January report-writing work	Half the amount originally budgetted, cut so that we could give each of our outside critics a 100.00 honorarium
30.00	FICA (Narramore)	
<u>280.00</u>		

190.00	Honorarium and expenses for guest aesthetician	This entire amount stems exclusively from Project QUILL-related evaluation of the experiment
235.00	Honorarium and expenses for theatre critic and his wife	
31.50	Planning luncheon with 3 campus monitors and 2 FIPSE faculty directors	
147.00	Copies of textbooks and other course materials to 3 monitors, 2 FIPSE directors, and 2 outside critics	
<u>603.50</u>		

22.00	Postage, including textbooks and other mailings above	Two-thirds of this amount is Project-QUILL related
5.00	Telephone: contacts with 2 outside critics	
75.75	Duplication of syllabus, evaluation sheets, audience survey mailing, etc.	
46.14	Mimeo supplies for the above	
<u>148.89</u>		

40.00	Typing of <u>Report</u> (estimate)	This estimate may prove to be a bit high. Even so, it provides nothing for subsequent expressed interest in the <u>Report</u> which would require further duplication and postage costs
50.00	Duplication of 60 copies of <u>Report</u> (estimate)	
10.00	Postage for mailing <u>Report</u> to parties already requesting them (estimate)	

 100.00

2167.09

TOTALS

 1830.00 in hand from
 Project QUILL
 200.00 forthcoming from
 Project QUILL

 2030.00

 2030.00
 137.09

 EST. DEFICIT to be
 paid by Austin College
 funding sources for
 curriculum development
 and renewal

In reviewing for themselves the expenditure tally above, readers may wish to consider our projection with respect to a repetition of the course under normal conditions. As we see it, the cost of a major production is already absorbed in our pilot's balance sheet by Project QUILL-related expenditures:

280.00	Instructors' compensation not normally paid, although at some institutions "team teaching" arrangements must be compensated for in some budgetary fashion, we realize.
603.50	Evaluation items and evaluators' expenses
100.00	Two-thirds of pilot venture's 148.89 cost for special printed course materials
100.00	Cost of <u>Report</u> duplication and distribution
<u>1083.50</u>	

With the above in mind one readily could plan a course in accord with our model/method on much the same basis as he or she and a colleague would for usual instructional and production purposes. That, in fact, is precisely what we anticipate doing in preparation for our own repetition of the pilot venture in the Fall of 1981 or the Spring of 1982.

APPENDIX A

Hinkle/Narramore's Proposal to Project QUILL

PROPOSAL for an AAC QUILL
PROJECT at Austin College for the
Academic Year, 1979-80

G.H. Hinkle
W.D. Narramore

ART AS PARTICIPATION: THE USE OF AN AESTHETIC
MODEL AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY TEACHING METHOD

Perhaps the process of art is unique in that it is an event which allows itself to be discussed and legitimately interpreted as though it were merely a thing. If this is so, should it not be assumed that the primary subject matter of aesthetics... (is) the aesthetic event itself?

-- Matthew Lipman, Contemporary Aesthetics

The Nature, Operation, Objectives
and Outcome of the Project

Taking into account Lipman's query above, a reviewer of Richard Hornby's recent volume on the art of drama reminds readers that a major preoccupation among scholars and artists alike today is the search for an "integrated symbolism" appropriate to "the felt reality" of the arts. In philosophy "process" models, once confined largely to variants of Whiteheadian metaphysics, are now in evidence in several independent avenues and schools of philosophic inquiry. Similarly, "structuralist" approaches to aesthetic criticism of the Mukarovsky kind increasingly inform studies of the theatre.

In both disciplines to date, however, the emphasis has been restricted to once-removed analytic considerations. The proposed experimental course, to the contrary, seeks to provide a carefully selected and monitored pilot group of students with not only the theoretical (symbolic) expression of the art experience, but also the occasion for participating directly in its distinctive (felt) character.

From its introductory weeks of contextual lectures and discussions of relevant readings to its post-production final week of recapitulation the pilot venture will keep before those enrolled a variety of "process" and/or "structuralist" accounts of aesthetic inquiry and dramatic interpretation. More importantly, special attention will be given during the latter half of the course to the philosophic and theatrical nuances which obtain as an initially formal envisionment of a play's nature is translated into the myriad of informal decisions which rehearsals and performances demand.

Twenty-six students are already in a "pool" of volunteers who know only that they will be involved in a philosophy-theatre, learning-doing exercise for the Fall Term of 1979. Happily, they are divided fourteen female and twelve male, as well as fourteen theatre concentrators and twelve non-theatre concentrators. By the same token, the play to be produced calls for twelve speaking roles and six-to-eight non-speaking roles (in part overlapped with technical crew assignment possibilities), and leaves a final four-to-six students free for full-time attention to production matters. Consequently, any combination of twenty or more of the volunteers would guarantee near-equal involvement by the entire class in both the reflective and the experimental deminsions of the model/method employed.

The initial six weeks of the course will concentrate on the study of several traditional schools of thought in aesthetics and on introductory accounts of the multiple nature of the artistry of theatre, culminating in an analytic model of "process" and "structure" applicable to current philosophical and theatrical judgments on the art experience. A subsequent two-week period will focus on the play to be produced by the class with particular concern for its representative character vis-a-vis the model in question. Tryouts likewise will take place during this interim segment of the course. Five weeks will be given over to play production, regularly interspersed with on-going class assessments of the "dynamic" of rehearsals, production staff work, and the like. A final week of post-production sessions will assess the model from the vantage-point of class and audience reaction to the performances.

Students should come away from the experiment with both an enhanced awareness, philosophically, of the multi-faceted nature of a performing art and a heightened sense, theatrically, of those factors which contribute to the aesthetic impact of an actual artistic endeavor.

Timetable for the Project

Although the co-instructors in the pilot venture will develop its basic outline and secure its primary sources as early as May of 1979, they plan full and final attention to its operative features during the latter part of August. Similarly, approximately half of January, 1980, will be set aside to tabulate and report on the various evaluative instruments to be used for those individuals, institutions, and agencies interested in the experimental model/method proposed (see next two items below).

The course itself will be offered on a regular Austin College Fall Term (fourteen weeks) basis from September through December, 1979

Exportability and Replicability (Relationship) of the Project

Four avenues for further utilization of the proposed experiment's results presently enjoy the status of preliminary contacts and requests for eventual summative reporting:

1. Colleagues and departments at Austin College already committed to interdisciplinary teaching look with special interest on possible regular use of philosophy-art offering along lines to be tested by the pilot course. Since innovation and experimentation in the cause of quality liberal learning are the hallmarks of the College's educational policy, such future variations are wellnigh certain.
2. CAEL, whose regional representatives are on the Austin College faculty and whose contacts include colleges and universities in a five-state region, will conduct its own evaluation of the pilot course and make its potential for enhancing experiential learning known to other institutions in the Southwest.

3. AIHE/AAHE affiliate school administrators familiar with Hinkle's prior experimentation with the teaching of aesthetics have indicated interest in the Hinkle-Narramore alignment of the model with the method described herein. Fifteen such contacts include Colby, Wilson, and Washington and Jefferson colleges, Milliken and Redlands universities.
4. CEMREL, Inc. of St. Louis (Dr. Kevin Saunders, Associate Director and contact person) has offered to distribute the results of the experiment throughout its national network of Aesthetic Education Learning Centers, including those on the campuses of Illinois State University and Oklahoma City University and those affiliated with Centerport's Performing Arts Foundation of Long Island and Washington's Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Evaluation of the Project

In addition of CAEL's self-designed evaluation and indirect indications of the course's results discernible in the quality of student reading reports, discussion leadership, and commitment to the production's demands, three instruments will be prepared especially for the pilot venture:

1. A sequential, detailed student questionnaire, composed of rating and ranking devices related to each segment of the experiment, will be kept up-to-date by each student.
2. Two sets of reflective prose-assessment forms related to the "observable evolution" of the production itself will be completed by each student. The one set will be designed with particular attention to the evaluative vantage-point of students in the cast, the other with regard to that of students on the production staff.
3. Two faculty monitors (one from the College's Department of Philosophy, the other from its Department of Communication Arts) will develop their own questionnaire and/or personal interview approaches to assessing student understandings of the two disciplines in question.

In all, five means will be available for determining the potentiality for "transfer" and "integration" between cognitive inquiry and experiential encounter respecting a performing art on which the model/method is based and to which the experiment is devoted.

APPENDIX B

Course Syllabus

Fall Term 1979

SYLLABUS for

Project QUILL

Experimental Course

"Art as Participation: The Use
of an Aesthetic Model as an
Interdisciplinary Teaching Method"

Course Resources:

- A. Texts to be Purchased - Peter Brook, The Empty Space
- G.H. Hinkle, Art as Event
- Playscript, Feast of Ashes
- B. Texts for Class Team
Reports (2 each on reserve) - Eric Bentley (ed.) The Theory
of the Modern Stage
- Tillman & Cahn (ed.) Philosophy
of Art and Aesthetics

Course/Project Evaluators:

- A. Prof. George Hazzard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, director-
evaluator for national Project QUILL (Quality in Liberal
Learning) of the Association of American Colleges and the
Ford Foundation
- B. Prof. Myron Low, Austin College, deputy director-evaluator for
Southwest Region of CAEL (Council for the Advancement of
Experiential Learning)
- C. Prof. Harry Thompson, Austin College, evaluator for Department
of Communication Arts (Theatre)
- D. Prof. David Schrader, Austin College, evaluator for Department
of Philosophy (Aesthetics)
- E. Prof. Bonnie Kelterborn & Prof. Karen Nelson, evaluators for
Austin College's role in national FIPSE (Fund for the Improve-
ment of Postsecondary Education) project on "Student-Faculty
Development and Learning Correlations" of the U.S. Department
of Health, Education, and Welfare
- F. Prof. John McDermott, Texas A. & M. University, guest critic
for aesthetics
- G. Prof. Howard Stein, University of Texas at Austin, guest critic
for theatre

(more)

Instruments/Modes of Evaluation:

Note: Student participation in each of the following undertakings will be graded proportionate to amount of involvement assigned or assumed in every case.

- A. Class team reports and general examination for all during and at the close of the first half of the course
- B. Serial questionnaire on major lecture segments of first half of the course for all
- C. Kelterborn-Nelson questionnaire to be taken by all for the purpose of selecting certain students for further participation in FIPSE project
- D. Low-Thompson-Schrader interviews for select students, on call during latter half of the course
- E. Cast or crew work as assigned throughout latter half of course
- F. Reflective journals by all students with variant formats, depending on one's cast or crew assignment, during latter half of the course

Schedule of Class Meetings:

Tuesday, Sept. 4 Explanation of Experimental Design and Objectives of the Course; Distribution and Discussion of Study Materials, Assignment Plan, Evaluation Modes, etc.

(HINKLE & NARRAMORE)

To be Read by All: Chapter Four of Hinkle's
Art as Event

Thursday, Sept. 6 The Problem of Art, philosophically considered, in the Tradition of Aesthetic Inquiry; The Nature of Theatre as a Distinctive Art Form and as an Art among the Arts

(HINKLE & NARRAMORE)

To be Read by All: Chapter One of Hinkle's
Art as Event

Tuesday, Sept. 11 The Structural Approach in Aesthetics: Art as Medium and Object

(HINKLE)

Class Team Report: Aristotle Selection in
Tillman & Cahn

(more)

- Thursday, Sept. 13 The Psychological Approach in Aesthetics: Art
as Creative Self-Expression
(HINKLE)
- Class Team Report: Schopenhauer Selection in
 Tillman & Cahn
- Tuesday, Sept. 18 The Cultural Approach in Aesthetics: Art
as Communal Enhancement
(HINKLE)
- Class Team Report: Collingwood Selection in
 Tillman & Cahn
- Thursday, Sept. 20 The Process Approach in Aesthetics: Art
as Expressive Human Symbolization and
Activity
(HINKLE)
- Class Team Report: Langer Selection in
 Tillman & Cahn
- To be Read by All: Chapters Two and Three
 of Hinkle's Art as Event
- Tuesday, Sept. 25 Major Theories and Types of Drama
(NARRAMORE)
- Class Team Report: Stanislavski Selection in
 Bentley
- To be Read by All: Chapters One and Two of
 Brook's Empty Space
- Thursday, Sept. 27 Major Theories and Types of Drama, continued
(NARRAMORE)
- Class Team Report: Artaud Selection in
 Bentley
- To be Read by All: Chapters Three and Four of
 Brook's Empty Space
- Tuesday, Oct. 2 Aesthetic Sensitivity in a Non-Western
Setting; Viewing and Interpretation of
filmed NOH PLAY
(NARRAMORE)
- Thursday, Oct. 4 Final Reflections on Theatre as a Performing
Art and as an Aesthetic Event
(NARRAMORE)
- Class Team Report: Brecht Selection
 in Bentley

(more)

To be Read by All: Playscript, Feast
 of Ashes

Thursday, Oct. 25 Initial sessions with Cast and Crew on
Overall Production Planning
(HINKLE & NARRAMORE)

Tuesday, Nov. 5 Regular Classhours will be used for cast
through and crew sessions, as well as Evening Hours
Tuesday, Dec. 4 for rehearsals beginning Nov. 12

Thursday, Nov. 8 "Progress Analysis" Sessions will be held
Thursday, Nov. 15 during the regular classhour with all members
and of the class attending, independent of on-going
Thursday, Nov. 29 cast and crew schedules

7 pm, Wednesday, Dec. 5 Dress Rehearsal with invited reviewer
and photographer only

47

8 pm, Thursday, Dec. 6	<u>Public Performance</u> with guest critic or critics
8 pm, Friday, Dec. 7	<u>Public Performance</u> with guest critic or critics
9 am & 1 pm, Saturday, Dec. 8	<u>Video Taping of Production</u> , scene by scene with cast on call
2 pm, Sunday, Dec. 9	<u>Public Performance</u> with guest critic or critics
Tuesday, Dec. 11	Production Wrap-Up with Video Tape viewing
Thursday, Dec. 13	Course Wrap-Up with Philosophy, Theatre, CAEL, and FIPSE Evaluators
Friday, Dec. 14	<u>Due Date</u> for any remaining assigned evaluation items (questionnaires, journals, etc.)

Cast/Crew Production Assignments:

Note: At least thirty positions are open below and,
where necessary, some overlapping is possible.

- A. Cast Roles - 11 speaking parts (6 men, 5 women)
- 1 folk gospel singer (1 woman)
- 6 non-speaking parts as townspeople (2 additional
men, 4 additional women)
- B. Crew Roles - Director (W.D. Narramore)
- Dramaturge (G.H. Hinkle)
- Production Manager who coordinates
work of:
- Technical Director whose committees
are:
- Lighting
- Costumes
- Makeup
- Stage Manager whose committees
are:
- Stage Crew
- Properties
- House Manager whose committees
are:
- Publicity
- Programs
- Ushering
- - - - -

APPENDIX C

Student Evaluation Plan and Forms

GUIDE SHEETS FOR

Serial QUESTIONNAIRE and

Reflective JOURNAL

Evaluations

Student Identification Plan:

Each member of the class is to adopt a fictitious name, using it on Questionnaire Sheet #1 and on all subsequent sheets, his or her Reflective Journal, and in interviews (where applicable) with Professors Low, Thompson, and Schrader. Real names will be used for the Kelterborn-Nelson FIPSE instrument, however.

In other words, we are not interested in learning your identities; but we are very interested in correlating your responses to the various segments of the experimental course.

Finally, adopt a simple, straight-forward name like "Butch" or "Bessy", "Juno", or "Rapheal" -- one that can be used with ease in both statistical and prose summaries of student evaluations in the Quill Report at the end of the Fall Term. Thank you.

Guide Sheets Attached:

Questionnaire Sheet #1 - covering opening sessions of the course (Sept. 4 and Sept. 6)

Questionnaire Sheet #2 - covering lecture and class report sequence on aesthetics (Sept. 11, 13, 18, 20)

Questionnaire Sheet #3 - covering lecture and class report sequence on theatre (Sept. 25, 27, Oct. 2 and Oct. 4)

Questionnaire Sheet #4 - covering viewing and interpretation sessions on motion pictures (Oct. 9, 10, 11)

Questionnaire Sheet #5 - covering dramaturgical and theatrical analyses of Feast of Ashes in preparation for production segment of the course (Oct. 18 and Oct. 23)

Reflective Journal Guidelines for Cast Members

Reflective Journal Guidelines for Crew Members

Project QUILL
Experimental Course

Questionnaire Sheet #1

Fictitious Name _____ Is Communication Arts among
your A.C. concentrations?
_____yes _____no

Opening Sessions of the Course
(Sept. 4 and Sept. 6) - Objectives:

1. To make clear both the promise and the pitfalls of the experimental design of the course, so that class members are appropriately, but not overly, expectant regarding its likely character and outcome
2. To clarify the division of leadership between the two instructors for the duration of the course, as well as the range (academic, participatory, and evaluative) of responsibility expected of class members
3. To provide a preliminary overview of the nature of aesthetic inquiry and of that of theatre theory and practice

In your judgment how well were these
objectives met?

1. Circle one: Poorly Adequately Quite Well
2. Comments:

Turn in within one week of the
time of the sessions covered

Project QUILL
Experimental Course

Questionnaire Sheet #2

Fictitious Name _____

Lecture and Class Report Sequence
on Aesthetics (Sept. 11, 13, 18,
20) - Objectives:

1. To present four major approaches to philosophy of art, including a representative system presented by the instructor and one reported on by a class team of reporters in each case, which reflect both historic and on-going aesthetic models
2. To bring the several approaches to bear upon perennial questions concerning artistic creativity, the objects and activities of value in the process of doing art, and the relationship between private inspiration and public appreciation in matters of art criticism
3. To give final attention to the open-ended, process-oriented model for aesthetic inquiry which forms the basis for the experimental course design and for the class's participation in it during the latter half of the term -- with special attention to the "event of art" in the medium of theatre

In your judgment how well were these objectives met?

1. Circle one: Poorly Adequately Quite Well
2. Comments:

Turn in within one week of the
time of the sequence covered

Project QUILL
Experimental Course

Questionnaire Sheet #3

Fictitious Name _____

Lecture and Class Report Sequence
on Theatre (Sept. 25, 27, Oct. 2
and Oct. 4) - Objectives:

1. To elucidate Aristotle's theories of the drama which are fundamental to an understanding of the nature of the theatrical event
2. To examine the idea of the major theorists of the theatre and to discover how their ideas found expression in actual performances
3. To understand better the relation of script to the performance and the place of literature in the theatre

In your judgment how well were these objectives met?

1. Circle one: Poorly Adequately Quite Well
2. Comments:

Turn in within one week of the
time of the sequence covered

Project QULL
Experimental Course

Questionnaire Sheet #4

Fictitious Name _____

- * Viewing and Interpretation Sessions
on Motion Pictures (Oct. 9, 10,
11) - Objectives:

1. To explore the nature of the motion picture as a performance event and an aesthetic experience
2. To demonstrate the rhetoric of the motion picture with examples from Alfred Hitchcock's Psycho

In your judgment how well were these objectives met?

1. Circle one: Poorly Adequately Quite Well
2. Comments:

Turn in within one week of the time of the sessions covered

Project QUILL
Experimental Course

Questionnaire Sheet #5

Fictitious Name _____

Dramaturgical and Theatrical Analysis
of Feast of Ashes (Oct. 18 and
Oct. 23) - Objectives:

1. To make certain from the outset that the plan and purpose of the latter half of the course reinforces the learning in the first half of the course: namely, that production cast and crew assignments are set in an interpretative context of the play which is appropriate to the "process" view of aesthetics and of theatre already studied
2. To give a dramaturgical as well as a theatrical account of the background, writing, and potential performing of the untried play to be used in the course which provides insight into roles, settings, moods, and the like important to actors and production personnel -- that is, which makes meaningful in advance the parts one may be trying out for and the production tasks one may volunteer for or be assigned
3. To project a spirited, yet cautious, anticipation of what is required and of what is likely to result respecting the production preparation weeks ahead

In your judgment how well were these objectives met?

1. Circle one: Poorly Adequately Quite Well
2. Comments:

Turn in within one week of the
time of the sessions covered

Project QUILL
Experimental Course

Reflective Journal Guidelines

The General Nature of
each Reflective Journal:

1. Use the fictitious name already adopted for the Serial Questionnaire sheets.
2. Although it is not necessary, it might be well for you to purchase a thin, inexpensive bound notebook for recording your journal; so that it constitutes a single volume easy to handle and read.
3. Journal entries should be regular throughout the production preparation segment of the course; perhaps, they could be summed up after each of the three "Progress Analysis" Sessions for the whole class (Nov. 8, 15, 29), although that may not be often enough in some cases. In any event, it is better to plan on significant reflections than on mere "running commentary", since the insightfulness, not the length, of the journal is important.

The Overall Purpose and
Theme of each Journal:

1. Primary reflection should be on how well or poorly the "learning" half of the experimental course came to mind and/or was of direct benefit to your participation in the "doing" half of the course. Where possible and of special illustrative interest, be as specific in that regard as you can be: for example, in Chapter Four of Hinkle's Art as Event you will find some twenty student reflections on how some phase of their production assignment or some incident in their acting preparation brought a theory or feature of aesthetics or theatre to bear upon their own experience.
3. Thematically considered, each journal is to be a "plus" or "minus" record of reinforcement; or, as expressed in the original Hinkle-Narramore Project QUILL Proposal, of "transfer and integration between cognitive inquiry and experiential encounter respecting a performing art on which the model/method is based and to which the experiment is devoted".

Variant for Journals
by Cast Members:

Special Attention (in addition to the overall purpose and theme outlined above) should be given to reflections on "role and self consciousness" as it was or was not reinforced throughout rehearsals and during performances.

Variant for Journals
by Crew Members:

Special Attention (in addition to the overall purpose and theme outlined above) should be given to reflections on "sense of involvement and vital contribution" as it was or was not reinforced or throughout production tasks during performance duties.

APPENDIX D

Course Examination

EXAMINATION - THEORIES OF ART/THEATRE

PART I (50 points - 25 each) Select one HINKLE citation (under A) and one BROOK citation (under B) below. Expand, briefly but pointedly, on the concept and the context at issue in each case. In addition, enlarge to a degree on the significance -- in your own judgment, positively or negatively -- of viewing art and theatre in these ways.

- A. "The playscript, therefore, is best understood as that initial locus of the aesthetic of theatre whose status as an 'art event' at one and the same time serves the playwright and does not serve his or her play."

Art as Event, p. 70

- or "Turning, accordingly, to the decisive vision of the director as the second locus of the 'art event' of theatre, it is clearly the case that he or she alone is responsible for, and capable of, seeing the play 'whole.'"

Art as Event, p. 71

- B. "We are all aware that most of life escapes our senses: a most important explanation of the various arts is that they talk of patterns which we can only begin to recognize when they manifest themselves as rhythms or shapes."

The Empty Space, p. 42

- or "Fun continually needs a new electric charge: fun for fun's sake is not impossible, but seldom enough.... The strongest comedy is rooted in archtypes, in mythology, in basic recurrent situations; and inevitably it is deeply embedded in the social tradition."

The Empty Space, p. 70

PART II (50 points) Select one of the three paired aesthetic and theatre theorists-theories below. Develop at some length the several ways in which the pair you choose contribute mutually to, or disagree about, the stated theme in each case.

- A. "Psychological" aestheticians like TOLSTOY and SCHOPENHAUER, as compared with STANISLAVSKI, on the importance of empathy in drama...
- B. "Cultural" aestheticians like DEWEY and COLLINGWOOD, as compared with BRECHT, on the social nature and purpose of drama...
- C. "Process" aestheticians like TOMAS and BEARDSLEY, as compared with ARTAUD, on discerning the truly crucial factors which make for drama...

APPENDIX E

Audience Evaluation Mailing

To: Select Audience Evaluators
for Performances of Feast of Ashes

FROM: G.H. Hinkle, Professor of Philosophy
W.D. Narramore, Chairman: Department of Communication Arts
AUSTIN COLLEGE

RE: An Invitation (below) to Share in
an Educational Experiment

Dear Friend,

You are among a select group of Austin College students and faculty, as well as Sherman residents, whom we hope will be willing to attend a performance of Feast of Ashes and follow up that experience by completing the enclosed questionnaire.

Feast of Ashes, a previously untried play, brings to a close our experimental interdisciplinary course in the aesthetics of theatre. The course is being conducted as the principal feature of our proposal entitled "Art as Participation: The Use of an Aesthetic Model as an Interdisciplinary Teaching Method" for which we have been awarded a Ford Foundation grant under the auspices of the Association of American Colleges' national Project QUILL (Quality in Liberal Learning).

The model alluded to above views the "art event of theatre" as the masterful interweaving of some five or six distinct components (a playscript, a cast, a director, a technical crew, critics, etc.) of which the final is the audience. Indeed, audience reaction to a dramatic presentation oftentimes conditions the intensity of that presentation to the degree that the audience contributes almost as much to a performance as it gains from it.

If you have the time and the interest, therefore, please attend any one or more of the performances of Feast of Ashes (reservations, while not necessary, can be arranged at your request) and return the questionnaire as instructed on the enclosed form. Thank you very much.

Feast of Ashes: Beardsley Arena Theatre
Ida Green Communication Center
AUSTIN COLLEGE

8:00 pm: Thursday, December 6
8:00 pm: Friday, December 7
2:00 pm: Sunday, December 9

Enclosure: Questionnaire/Evaluation Form
Prepaid Mailing Envelope for Off-Campus Evaluators

Project QUILL
Experimental Course

SELECT AUDIENCE EVALUATION FORM

Thank you for cooperating in one of six kinds of evaluation being done on our experimental course and its culminating theatre production. May we, initially, secure the following information from you?

1. Are you an _____ Austin College Student
an _____ Austin College Faculty or Staff Member
a _____ Sherman Resident not associated directly
with Austin College

2. What previous interest and involvement in Austin College theatre have you had?

_____ never attended a play here before

_____ occasionally attend A.C. plays

_____ frequently/regularly attend them

3. As you will note below, the purpose of your evaluation of the performance of Feast of Ashes you attended is not focused on your reaction to the play itself; however, that reaction may condition somewhat the evaluation you make. Consequently, did you...

_____ like the play quite a lot?

_____ find the play uninteresting/distasteful?

Would you care to elaborate?

So, then, to the evaluation itself. In every case feel free to expand on your answers, but not obliged to do so.

1. What in your view "carried" the play most effectively?

- _____ the characters portrayed
- _____ the plot/action of the "story"
- _____ the elements of spectacle such as lighting, setting, special effects
- _____ the play's central theme or idea
- _____ the use of language in conveying "meaning" or "mood"

2. How Strong and sustained was your "empathy" or "sense of inclusion" in the mood, action, conflict, etc. of the performance?

- _____ very strong and quite sustained
- _____ generally strong, but often lagging
- _____ rarely strong, generally ineffectual

3. Did you feel you and others in the audience "contributed" to the intensity of the performance (that people were responsive to lines spoken and emotions portrayed by the actors appropriate to the intended dramatic nature of each dialogue, each scene, etc.)?

- _____ the audience was very much "in" the play
- _____ the audience seemed occasionally responsive, but generally passive
- _____ the audience was passive, by and large

4. Be it a character, a scene, a special effect, or whatever, what left the strongest impression on you from the entire performance—and the least impression?

Strongest impression:

Least impression:

Again, thank you for your cooperation. On-campus audience evaluators are urged to mail their completed questionnaires through inter-office mail to G.H. Hinkle, Campus Box 1550. Off-campus evaluators should use the prepaid envelope enclosed for that purpose with their copy of the questionnaire. If at all possible, the questionnaire should be mailed within two to three days...in no case later than December 15.

APPENDIX F

Proposal and Grant Budgets

BUDGET/Quill Project Proposal

G.H. Hinkle
W.D. Narramore

ART AS PARTICIPATION; THE USE OF AN AESTHETIC
MODEL AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY
TEACHING METHOD

Minimal Operational Needs:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. Script reproduction of manuscript draft of an untried play | 150.00 |
| 2. Staging, lighting, costuming, special publicity and programs for play production, figured at current average cost per production at the College | 1000.00 |
| 3. One major film rental for study purposes of the "still-stop" variety, illustrative of the dynamics of the performing art form | 150.00 |
| | <u>1300.00 (subtotal)</u> |

Secondary, but highly desirable, compensations:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. To Hinkle and Narramore for summer preparation time at typical special project funding rate at College . . | 500.00 |
| 2. To faculty monitors of project for planning and evaluation luncheon sessions, etc. | 50.00 |
| 3. To the College for instructional and production use of facilities, secretarial help, and office supplies for several evaluation instruments; reproductions, etc. . . | 180.00 |
| | <u>730.00 (subtotal)</u> |

Total for minimal and secondary items: 2030.00

Hinkle/Narramore
File Facsimile of QUILL BUDGET
(submitted 4/9/79)

Project QUILL Number 3-A-103

Institution Austin College

PROJECT TITLE Art as Participation: The Use of An Aesthetic
Model as An Interdisciplinary Teaching Method

BUDGET	QUILL GRANT
Salaries	\$ <u>500.00</u> (2 instructors)
FICA	<u>30.00</u>
All Other Benefits	
Honoraria	<u>250.00</u> (2 faculty monitors & 2 outside critics)
Total Compensation	<u>780.00</u>
Travel - Staff	<u> </u>
Travel - Other (2 outside critics)	<u>100.00</u>
Equipment Rental (teaching film)	<u>150.00</u>
Postage and Mailing	<u>15.00</u>
Telephone and Telegraph	<u>15.00</u>
Printing and Duplication (classroom materials, evaluative instruments)	<u>100.00</u>
Stationary and Supplies	<u>50.00</u>
Book, Other Publications (duplication of manuscript draft of untried play)	<u>120.00</u>
Rent	<u> </u>
Other (specify): <u>staging, lighting,</u> <u>costuming, special publicity and</u> <u>programs for play production</u>	<u>700.00</u>
TOTAL	\$ <u>2030.00</u>